The Classical Weekly

VOLUME XXIX, No. 16   MONDAY, MARCH 9, 1936   WHOLE No. 788

REVIEW

Homer and Mycenae. By Martin P. Nilsson. London
(Methuen and Company, 1933). Pp. xii, 283. 52 Illus-
trations, 4 Maps.

At the beginning of Chapter IV, Homeric Language
and Style (160–183), Professor Nilsson well notices the
new movement in philology, away from phonetic
changes, and toward the influence on Homer's language
of the verse form and of traditional epic diction. He
shows that the main element blended with the Epic
Ionic is Aeolic, and that Attic forms that are significant
are rare. Here he uses the help of Professor Wacker-
nagel; and agrees with him (162) that the Teichoskopia
in Iliad 3 is the only passage likely to be by an Attic
poet. The Aeolic is ancient rather than of historical
times; and, though the process is too complicated to
be called, after Fick, a translation from Aeolic, many
considerations, especially the occurrence in Arcado-
Cypriote of Homeric words which scarcely survive else-
where, show that Ionic-speaking minstrels adopted
Aeolic poetry that was already old (174). The epic
language was perpetually developing under the in-
fluence of tradition and convention. Old forms were re-
tained in the same metrical place. This affects the Ho-
meric Question. The Separatists assumed that the
language of minstrels evolved naturally, and that later
parts of the Homeric Poems would include later forms
of words[9]. They made statistics, which are wrong, as

---

[9] In connection with the excellent account of Homeric language,
which is one of the best parts of the book, there are very few ques-
tions to raise. It may be asked, however, why ἆμαρ, 'day', should
not be good Doric, and why ἕλος, 'marsh', should not be good Ionic
(175). Good use is made of the important evidence from Arcado-
Cypriote words, as investigated especially by Mr. C. M. Bowra,
Tradition and Design in the Iliad, 142–146 (Oxford: At the Claren-
don Press, 1930). Compare now an article by Mr. Bowra, Homeric
Words in Cyprus, The Journal of Hellenic Studies 54 (1934), 54–74.
The Aeolic epic was carried after the Dorian invasion to Asia Minor,
and was there used and gradually altered by Ionic minstrels (177–
188). It was brought to Attica from Ionia, probably about 600
B. C., when the great interest of Athens in the Hellespont began.
Now, elsewhere (90, 111, 249) Professor Nilsson strangely accepts
a very late date, the seventh century B. C., for the foundation of
Aeolic colonies in Northern Asia Minor. Clearly, then, many Aeo-
lians must have settled in Asia long before this, and the fact should
be emphasized. L. R. Farnell, Cults of the Greek States, 4.168–169
(Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1907), argues that the Aeolic
settlements were founded before the Pythian cult of Apollo became
strong, and therefore very early indeed, since the Pythian Apollo is
not known in the Aeolic cities, though he is well known in the Ionic
cities to the South. Secondly, it is strange if no epic was preserved
in Northern Greece at all (though there is a parallel for this in Teu-
tonic epic), and if none of this poetry was ever communicated
directly to Athens, before it was fetched back from Asia Minor.
Perhaps these questions need some discussion.
Professor Nilsson seems to me to emphasize if anything too
much the abnormal development of epic language (172). Epic
technique constantly drew on an inherited stock of material; and
a poet's "genius was displayed in other forms than those which we
are wont to take as natural for poetical work" (183). Now, both
epic and later, more 'normal' poetry will be better understood if

---

Professor Scott showed. They did not understand the
principle of distribution. The epic mixture is like knead-
ed dough, not stratified. In fact this abnormal develop-

their essential similarity is recognized.
Poets habitually accept suggestion from former poetry and prose,
and they often reproduce the very words which they inherit from
others, sometimes in the old combinations, sometimes in new. This
is almost a universal characteristic of literature, alike in Europe
and in other continents. Two distinctions are necessary. Some poets
tend to maintain the same combinations of words and ideas and
images which they have inherited. Among them is Shakespeare,
who will often almost transcribe translations of Plutarch and Ovid.
Others, who avoid direct transcription, remember scattered refer-
ences from many earlier works, and reproduce them, perhaps years
afterwards, in new combinations, with new meanings. To this
second class belong many poets, and in particular Vergil, Gray,
and Coleridge. The second distinction, of course, is between pas-
sages of poetry which contain reminiscences of earlier work, and
those which do not. I consider, though I cannot argue this here,
the derivative and reminiscent class primary. This is especially the
method appropriate to oral poetry. In later written poetry it sur-
vives, but some poems and some passages of poetry are not ap-
parently very closely dependent on earlier poems. The dependence
is probably still there, but it is of a different kind, or of several
different kinds, less literal, and less concerned with words.

This dependence may be internal to the work of a single poet,
for his words and his treatment of his material may be determined
by words and treatment which he has himself used before, by a
process which, like dependence of other kinds, is closely connected
with sound and rhythm. Compare Jan van Gelder, De Woordher-
haling bij Catullus (The Hague, De Zuid-Hollandsche Boek-en
Handelsdrukkerij, 1933), especially Chapters IV and V. Again, the
external dependence on other poets may be principally psycho-
logical, active in the form of the thought rather than in words.
Compare Maud Bodkin, Archetypal Patterns in Poetry (London,
The Oxford University Press, 1934), passim, especially Chapters I
and VI, where the tendency for poetry to conform to certain in-
herited schematisms is shown. Poets, and prose writers too, may,
of course, depend on the plastic arts, either consciously or un-
consciously. Herodotus not only writes in a tragic form, but he
groups personalities and incidents as they would appear in a pedi-
ment; there is even such a 'mythology' in Thucydides. Compare
John Linton Myres, The Mythical Element in History, a paper
read to The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies in Lon-
don, Tuesday, February 5, 1935.

Samuel Johnson used to contend that Homer was an uniquely
original poet, and that all subsequent imaginative literature de-
pends on him, with changes of name and recombinations of inci-
dent. In contrast with this, legitimate arguments can now be
offered to show that, if Vergil uses a method of derivation and de-
pendence, and that is held to be a fault, at any rate Homer is no
better, since he used the very words of former poetry. Compare
Aurelio Espinosa Pólit, S. I., Virgilio, El Poeta y su Misión Provi-
dencial (Quito, Editorial Ecuatoriana, 1932): see pages 36–113, es-
pecially 58–81. To Father Espinosa a later poet may be not more
derivative than Homer; whereas to Professor Nilsson Homer's per-
petual derivations and dependence are characteristic of epic, and
abnormal, in a context of general literature. It is time to see that
the results of all these thinkers, and many more, should in reality
converge. Derivation and dependence are characteristic of literature
as literature, or even as art, and may even be necessary to give each
artist a clearly defined place in the tradition to which he belongs.

As Mr. T. S. Eliot (Selected Essays, 1917–1932, 15 [London,
Faber and Faber, 1932]) writes, "No poet, no artist of any art, has
his complete meaning alone. His significance, his appreciation, is
the appreciation of his relation to the dead poets and artists. You
cannot value him alone; you must set him, for contrast and com-
parison, among the dead. I mean this as a piece of aesthetic, not
merely historical criticism. The necessity that he shall conform, that
he shall cohere, is not one-sided; what happens when a new work
of art is created is something that happens simultaneously to all
the works of art which preceded it". Compare this (Eliot, 17):
"What is to be insisted on is that the poet must develop or procure
the consciousness of the past and that he should continue to de-
velop this consciousness throughout his career.
What happens is a continual surrender of himself as he is at
the moment to something which is more valuable. The progress of
an artist is a continual self-sacrifice, a continual extinction of per-
sonality.
There remains to define this process of depersonalization and
its relation to the sense of tradition. It is in this depersonalization

ment happened twice, once in the Aeolic, and again in the Ionic stage. The long history of the epic language shows that epic goes back far into the Mycenaean Age, and that its origin was in mainland Greece. It was preserved in Northern Asia Minor. The old 'pen in hand view' of epic composition is refuted by such considerations, and especially by the observation of obsolete words.

For the thesis that Greek epic arose in the Mycenaean Age confirmation is now found by a review of other heroic ages, in Chapter V, The Origin and Transmission of Epic Poetry (184–211). The Mycenaean Age was a true heroic age, and provides a suitable background for epic poetry. The comparative method, Professor Nilsson says, was started by Steinthal in 1868; but, though it is right, it is subject to dangers from a wrong use of analogies[10]. However, much important illumination is given by the other heroic ages, and perhaps especially by those which are less familiar. Personages in these epics are historical, but of different times. In the Russian 'Bylinas' there are mixed elements, including Viking ships and firearms (192). The Finnish Kalevala even mentions coffee-drinking and a telescope (194). The Siberian Kara-Kirgizes have epic poets who adapt their sentiments to their audiences, referring to the past, but admitting praise of living men (195). The art of the poet consists in coordinating readymade material according to the course of a story, and connecting old passages by newly composed verses. In a general description of the rise of epic (197–205), which must of course be largely speculative, Professor Nilsson offers the important principle (202) that "not the poems but the poetical art is learnt....", and that in spite of

that art may be said to approach the condition of science".

The nature of unconscious, imaginative derivation by poets of words, phrases, and images from former poetry, to be reshaped into a new poetic expression, has been principally investigated by Professor John Livingstone Lowes, The Road to Xanadu[2] (London, Constable and Company, 1931; the first edition appeared in 1926); and his results have been applied to Vergil's method by Professor Edward Kennard Rand, The Magical Art of Virgil (Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1931). <For a review, by Mr. Knight, of this book see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 28 (1934), 145–148. C. K.>. Compare also, for borrowing by poets in general, E. E. Kellett, Literary Quotation and Allusion (Cambridge, W. Heffer and Sons, 1933), and W. A. Edwards, Plagiarism, An Essay on Good and Bad Borrowing (Cambridge, Gordon Fraser, The Minority Press, 1933).

I think, therefore, that here is an inference from the results of Professor Nilsson, and from those of Dr. Milman Parry which he has used (179–180), that is required to show the true importance and therefore the true meaning of those results. Epic dependence is an early form of those kinds of dependence, derivation, and mediate artistic suggestion which are characteristic of literature in general, and probably of all the arts. From the epic language 'which makes your poetry, and does your thinking, for you', later artistic language develops. There are movements away from verbal dependence, as the lyrical movement in seventh-century Lesbos, and a part, but only a part, of the romantic movement in England a hundred years ago. But in spite of them there is some continuity, and literary and artistic dependence is a principle of criticism which Professor Nilsson has greatly helped to establish.

[10]A rather sharper distinction seems to be required between epic material, on the one hand, which is known in other lands than Greece, and which existed in Greece also, though there it has not survived in this form, and, on the other hand, the fully developed artistic Greek epic, Kunstepos, of which the Iliad and the Odyssey stand almost alone now as examples. Compare Wilhelm Schmid and Otto Stählin, Griechische Litteraturgeschichte[3], I.1.74–83 (Munich, Beck, 1929); Felix Jacoby, Homerisches, Hermes 68 (1933), 3. The latter stresses the lack of unity in other epic, except principally the Kalevala, whose unity was imposed late. The comparative method was not, however, first used by Steinthal (as Professor Nilsson says, 12, 184): compare, for example, F. O. Welcker, Der Epische Cyclus[2] (as cited in note 3, above), 2.330–332, and 332, note 592. Perhaps Professor Nilsson's views are in part a natural development of the 'compilation theory' which he himself criticizes early in his book (35).

stock material every recitation is more or less an improvisation. He applies to the epic style Goethe's words (202): "eine Sprache, die für dich dichtet und denkt". The nature of Homeric poetry agrees with these analogies; and this is confirmed by mention of minstrels in the Homeric Poems[11]. Professor Nilsson would like to call the great poet who shaped the Iliad Homer; but he supposes that it was another great poet who, some time later, created the Odyssey (210). Whether writing was known or not is irrelevant; perhaps it was, but probably it was not used for long poems so early as the eighth century, when the Iliad and the Odyssey were composed.

In Chapter VI, State Organization in Homer and in the Mycenaean Age (212–247), the same method again shows that early and late elements in the Homeric Poems are not stratified. Though the background is not all Mycenaean, carefully chosen analogies, which "at least show what is possible" (214), suggest that old social and political conditions will have been retained in the poems; and in fact the state organization reflected by Homer agrees best with the kind of monarchy which seems to have existed in the Mycenaean Age[12].

[11]In the investigation of the epic method important principles emerge, including the stages by which epic usually develops, and the nature of the minstrel's task. There is a danger of over-simplification. For example, allowance must be made for many different origins of various kinds of poetry and music; all do not descend from heroic lays, nor are heroic lays, and, for example, wedding and funeral chants to be classed together necessarily. Compare C. M. Bowra, Tradition and Design in the Iliad, 32–39, 53–66 (see note 9, above): there the history of the hexameter also is examined. Account should be taken of this, and of available research into primitive poetry, for instance of the American Indians. For a recent discussion of early poetry not epic in character compare Rutland Boughton, The Reality of Music, Parts I–III, especially Part I (London, Kegan Paul, 1934). It might have been observed (200) that a change from musical accompaniment to the carrying of a staff is not the only explanation of the notices in Pausanias 10.7.3 and the scholiast on Pindar, Nemean Odes 2, at the beginning: compare T. W. Allen, Homer, The Origins and the Transmission, 91 (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1924).

[12]The attempt to show that the state organization in Homer is predominatingly Mycenaean is most successful, and there is not much improvement to be suggested. It may be asked, however, whether and in what sense classes existed in the Mycenaean society; whether the army assembly included everyone, or only leaders; and whether invading aristocracies and conquered populations both sent representatives on military expeditions.

As to the Mycenaean origin of Greek myths, which Professor Nilsson treated more fully in his former book (compare the opening lines of the text, above), the main thesis may be accepted; but it should be remembered here that the myths of the Greeks and of other peoples also can to a great extent be plausibly derived from the very early East and especially from the epic of Gilgamesh. Compare the work of Dr. P. Jensen, and of others to which references are given by Friedrich Pfister, Die Religion der Griechen und Römer...., Darstellung und Literaturbericht (1918–1929/30), 155–156 (Leipzig, O. R. Reisland, 1930). I am inclined, except for certain purposes, to dissent from the more general "diffusionist" theories; but the possibility that some elements of a mythological complex may be due to diffusion must be remembered. And it must not be forgotten that almost anything may happen to proper names in myth.

Professor Nilsson argues (249) that the main outlines of myth may be historical, but not the details. I should prefer to say that details may be of great importance in at least directing research to more or less historical truth. But for this purpose it is necessary to distinguish not only the mythical from the factual, but also, inside the mythical category, the kind of myth which is principally an inaccurate account of the events which it claims to describe, and another kind, which furnishes accretions that have their origin in circumstances other than the facts to which they are now applied. The first kind of myth I call 'legend', and I reserve the word 'myth' for the second kind. 'Legend' therefore to me is a prescientific and inaccurate account of real events; while 'myth' may be a statement about supposed facts of the physical or theological world. 'Myth', of course, especially if the opponents of Sir James G. Frazer are right, may equally have originated in actual events and relations between individual people; but it has become generalized, often on account of the symbolic meanings of individuals in ritual acts. I also maintain that legend will attract an accretion of myth most readily when that myth is already morphologically similar to the existing legend. I have sought to apply this theory to the story

Lastly, Professor Nilsson returns to that approach to the Homeric Question which he has made peculiarly his own; and in Chapter VI, Mythology in Homer (248–278), he applies and extends his former results. Mythological centers are the same as the centers of Mycenaean life; and they always have myths, except a few places such as Midea and Gla, which were abandoned early. Homeric myths were transmitted by poets, and only the general outlines, not the details, are likely to represent history. Troy is the central fact: it was besieged, and probably captured, by a Greek combination under Agamemnon in late Mycenaean times[13]. Many of the other personalities are more or less fictitious, among them Menelaus and Helen. Little was known of Trojan personalities. Achilles and Diomedes are two parallel personalities, adapted from myth by Homer for his own purposes, and fused[14]. The Lycian myths in the Iliad had originally nothing to do with the Trojan War; they are derived from the early exploration by Greeks of Southwest Asia Minor, and have been incorporated into the Iliad for artistic reasons[15]. The central idea of the Iliad is psychological; and herein is the chief advance made by Homer. The divine mythology is, like the human, mainly Mycenaean; Zeus was at an early stage king of the gods. The gods are humanized; and, indeed, with Homer, myth had almost already become out of date (275)[16].

Professor Nilsson's book is important both for its coordination and interpretation of the existing results of Homeric research, and for the additions to these results which he himself has made[17]. He has left some problems only partly solved; but he has done a difficult and valuable thing, in constructing a system of

---

of the fall of Troy in my paper, Myth and Legend at Troy, Folk-Lore 46 (1935), 98–121.

[13]I am not sure whether it is now safe to call the Troy identified at Hissarlik ("the sixth city of Troy....")"a mighty and wealthy city...." (250); see Charles Vellay, Troie et Hissarlik, Parvula Inter Magnas, Revue des Études Homériques 1 (1933), 1–31, who, in support of his view that Troy must be sought elsewhere, argues that Hissarlik is far smaller than ordinary cities of Mycenaean times. Professor Nilsson opposes the views of M. Vellay (111, note 3), but the article to which I refer above appeared too late to be noticed by Professor Nilsson. Whatever may be thought of the identifications of Troy proposed (they seem to have been disproved now by excavations: compare Dr. Blegen [as cited in note 8, above], 31–34), I think that the unusually small size of the cities at Hissarlik is proved.
Professor Nilsson interestingly suggests that Agamemnon in Homer partly represents a time two hundred years before the Trojan War, when the wealth and the power of Mycenae were greatest (251), that is, that memories of the great age have colored the record of Trojan times, when the greatness was passing. This suggestion is all the more interesting since the latest excavations of Dr. C. W. Blegen have tended to show that the sixth city of Troy was in existence earlier than had been supposed, and that the destruction of the earlier seventh city (VII a) corresponds with the fall of Homeric Troy (see Blegen [as cited in note 8, above], 16–17).

[14]According to my own view, Professor Nilsson need not have decided that Helen, since she was a vegetation goddess, is therefore not a historical figure in the Trojan War (252–253), especially as elsewhere (198) he recognizes that "a man may become a myth during his lifetime....", and that in the Mycenaean world the right of succession frequently depended on an heiress (225–226). The probability that Helen is historical is shown by J. L. Myres and K. T. Frost, The Historical Background of the Trojan War, Klio 14 (1915), 447–461. I think it very doubtful that, if the evidence allows a belief in the historicity of Agamemnon (251), it does not readily allow a belief in the historicity of Menelaus and Helen (253). I suggested, in the article mentioned above (see note 12, above, at the end), that the peculiar mythical aspect of the Trojan War is partly due to the historical fact that Troy was exceedingly hard to enter, and required, apparently, supernatural means to that end. This fact became a legend; and the legend attracted to itself religious myth, morphologically similar, concerned with entry into the earth. It is possible that Helen is a goddess, and that her name has replaced in story the lost name of an historical captured princess. Such confusions are common; compare the myths of King Arthur and Alexander the Great. But to say that Helen's personality and history are true facts, though her name may be wrongly recorded, is very different from regarding Helen as wholly 'mythical'.

If so, there is no reason why Hector should not be historical (264–265), for his name can be credibly explained (as I suggested in Vergil's Troy, 124–127, and elsewhere [see note 3, above]); it seems in fact to be much more historical than the highly developed dramatic personality which he has in the Iliad. Nor, when the legends are examined, does there seem any reason to doubt that Troy fell (255); for the fall of the city is required to start the development of the legend and the accretions of myth. In dealing with the Trojan Horse, Professor Nilsson wisely thinks the tale may have been confused with another motive, and he well compares an Egyptian folk-tale (256). He might have cited also a story from Cedrenus 2.520.10 compared by Mr. T. W. Allen, Homer, The Origins and the Transmission, 159–160 (see note 11, above), and a story from Spanish history cited by Sir James G. Frazer, The Library of Apollodorus, 2.229–231 (The Loeb Classical Library, 1921). The other motive which Professor Nilsson suspects (256) may well be the conception of a centaur in the nucleus of a labyrinth, a pattern that represents the human anatomy and also the "walls of Troy". Compare E. Hommel, Orientalistische Literaturzeitung 12 (1919), 63–67. Again, I doubt very much whether the myth of Achilles is out of place in the Trojan War (255). To think so is to approach the views

of those who believe in 'Sagenverschiebung'; and it is not as if there was much probability that in pre-Homeric poetry Achilles was not represented as fighting at Troy, however small his original importance in that fighting may have been. Compare T. W. Allen, Homer, The Origins and the Transmission, 162–166, and elsewhere, especially 199.

[15]That the references to Lycia in the Iliad originally belonged to another story, and not to the tale of Troy (261–264) is by no means impossible; though it is not safe in the present state of excavation to say that Lycia was beyond the range of Trojan politics. There seems no reason to doubt that Priam in his youth, as Homer says (Iliad 3.184–190), fought a long way to the south of Troy. Other proofs that the myth of Bellerophontes and the Chimaera is Mycenaean cannot now be supported, as Professor Nilsson seeks to support it, by arguments from the glass plaque found at Dendra (261), since it has now been shown that the animal pictured there is not a Chimaera: compare Anne Roes, The Representation of the Chimaera, The Journal of Hellenic Studies 54 (1934), 21–25. That the chimaera was known to Mycenaeans is not hard to believe. It can be traced to oriental pictures, from which ultimately the description in Hesiod, Theogony 319–324 is derived: compare Ludolf Malten, Bellerophontes, Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts 40 (1925), 121.

[16]The question whether the theomachies in the Iliad are early or late conceptions cannot well, on the principles of Professor Nilsson's book, be answered by reference to the theomachy in the very old lay of Diomedes (267), for it has been already shown that the Homeric Poems cannot be treated like a chronologically stratified site. A better method would be to assume the hypothesis that theomachies are old, and that originally they determined the issue of the human fighting, but that in Homer they remain only as survivals, without much effect on the results of battles. Such a hypothesis can then be tested by analogies, and again by an examination of the Greek mythological tradition. There seems to be an echo of the older kind of theomachy in Quintus Smyrnaeus 12.157–213, where the gods take sides for and against the Wooden Horse. Again, even in Homer Apollo prevents by his intervention the capture of the Trojan wall (Iliad 16.700–709). Athena is blamed for the fall of Troy (Euripides, Troades 45–47); and in the Mycenaean Age she seems to have the same military and defensive attributes as Ishtar, for whom compare references in the Code of Hammurabi (Percy Handcock, The Code of Hammurabi, 245 [London and New York, The Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, Macmillan, 1920]): "May Ishtar, goddess of battle and conflict, who makes ready my weapons, the gracious protecting deity...."

Professor Nilsson refers briefly (269–272) to the small respect with which Homer treats many of the gods. This is a large question, which needs to be considered in a very wide context of general anthropology. For example, gods are disrespectfully treated in old Chinese drama. For an accessible account of this compare the article Theatre in the Encyclopaedia Britannica[11] (1926), a reference to which I was directed by the kindness of Mr. P. T. Williams.

[17]I note some treatments, not all necessarily producing entirely new results, which seem to me specially valuable: the distinction made between the Minoan and the Mycenaean cultures (71–82); the dating of Phoenician activity and other matters by reference to Sidon, destroyed 677 B. C. (130–137), and, (after Miss H. L. Lorimer), to Thebes in Egypt, imagined by Homer at the period of its greatest prosperity (157–158); the analysis of burial customs in Homer, now perhaps finally shown to represent a combination of Mycenaean and iron age practices (152–156), though the sudden discovery of bronze-age cremations at Hissarlik may now make some adjustment necessary: compare Carl W. Blegen, as cited in note 8, above; almost the whole account of the Homeric "Kunstsprache" (160–183); some particularly useful parallels to Homeric facts drawn from the epic of Sweden (191–193), Finland, and Esthonia (193–194), of the Kara-Kirgizes in Asia (195), of the Abakan-Tartars (195), of the Nartes in North Caucasus (196), and of the Atchinese in Sumatra (195–197), and inferences concerning the epic art in Greece (200–207); the description of the method by which Homer included in the Iliad material from various sources (256–266); and a balanced estimate of the Homeric similes (275–277).

thought in which there exists an inherent power of elastic development and change, as the future may demand.

BLOXHAM SCHOOL, NEAR BANBURY,
OXFORDSHIRE, ENGLAND   W. F. J. KNIGHT

THE SIMILES OF HORACE

No comprehensive study of the similes of Horace apart from his imagery as a whole has been published. We have the admirable work of Manucci[1]; but Manucci, not satisfied with the limitations of the term *comparatio* as defined by Priscian[1a] and by Wortmann[1b], whom he quotes, enlarges the field, as he says, to include 'examples, allegories, and metaphors manifestly functioning as comparisons', and adds that he ought rather to use the term 'images'. He then lists the passages containing images, to the number of 673, under nine headings[2], and discusses the contents of each group. In the second part of his work he considers the comparisons from the standpoint of form. He finds five main types[3], and discusses each type, with illustrations.

Manucci is right in so enlarging the field of the *comparatio* in the case of Horace, for Horace's poems are so rich in metaphor and illustration, and his similes so often run into metaphors that an attempt to separate the similes from the other images seems but a mere technical quibble, and leaves the feeling that one is doing scant justice to the poet. Yet, with all due apologies to Horace and with all due respect for the superior value of Manucci's work, I have made bold to attempt such a separation, for I have had a desire to see how the numerous similes of Horace would look in the outline form I have used in classifying graphically the similes of Homer, Apollonius of Rhodes, Vergil, and Ovid respectively[4]; and I have also wanted to see what a collection of Horace's similes as such might show regarding the type of simile used in satire and in melic poetry, and whether there is anything distinctive at all in Horace's use of the figure.

So far I have found it impossible to discover a definition of the term simile which entirely satisfies, and there is really no agreement among scholars as to just what it includes. Priscian's and Wortmann's definitions, for instance, are inadequate, if taken separately. Priscian says, Comparatio est vel similium, vel diversorum, vel minorum ad maiora, vel maiorum ad minora collatio[5]; Wortmann says, Existit comparatio si ad rem quan-

dam vel condicionem accuratius declarandam alia res satis nota apponitur et indicatur qua ratione altera alterius similis aut dissimilis sit[6]. However, if we combine Wortmann's definition with a slight amplification of Priscian's, we may arrive at a meaning for the term simile which is something like this: A simile is a stated comparison of one object, event, or experience with another differing from it generally in nature, class, or type: the comparison is an expression of some point of likeness or unlikeness, or a statement that one exceeds the other or falls short of it in some particular. So defined, at least one connecting word is essential to a simile, as distinguished from a metaphor, and, as a rule, from an illustration[7]. Such a definition does not exclude the fabulous, but in this study, and for the most part in my previous studies, I have not included in my list similes of the imagination, that is, comparisons so stated that they happen in imagined circumstances rather than in actual occurrence.

Collected on the basis of some such definition, the similes of Horace are, perhaps, rather surprisingly numerous; and they fall readily into the outline form mentioned above (see note 4, above). If we exclude, as it has seemed better to do, a handful in the Sermones (in Book I chiefly) pertaining to inconsequential contemporaries[8], there are 207 similes, only twelve fewer than in Vergil, although the bulk of Horace's poetry is much smaller. They occur with an average frequency of one for every 37.7 verses, a slightly higher frequency than in Apollonius of Rhodes, and much higher than in Homer[9]. They occur most frequently in the Epodes, and next in Carmina 4. Again excepting the peculiar group in the Sermones, we note that they are decidedly less frequent in the Sermones and the Epistulae, where their number is very nearly the same in each of the four books, and in Carmina 1 and 3. They occur least frequently of all in Carmina 2[10]. There is none in the Carmen Saeculare.

The range of subjects from which the similes are drawn is seen to be wide. With the exception of Carmina 4, every book of poems is represented by one or more similes from nearly every broad class of subjects. The Carmina and the Epodes, however, contain most of the similes from natural phenomena, from the vegetable and the animal worlds, and from myths and legends, while in the Sermones and the Epistulae, as we should expect from their content, similes are drawn chiefly from human activities and experiences and from the materials and the objects of civilized life. The similes from literary and historical characters and situations figure more largely in the Epodes than in either

---

[1]L. Manucci, Elemento Comparativo in Orazio (Florence, Bernardo Seeber, 1901).

[1a]See note 5, below.   [1b]See note 6, below.

[2]These headings give comparisons (1) from inanimate nature, the sky, and celestial phenomena, (2) from water, from things pertaining thereto, and from naval matters, (3) from the vegetable realm and things pertaining thereto, (4) from the animal realm and things pertaining thereto, (5) from the human body, its maladies, etc., (6) from the circus, the theater, and the army, (7) from sacred things, mythology, and history, (8) from painting, sculpture, music, poetry, history of literature, etc., (9) from customs, manners, and various things.

[3]These five types he designates as (1) loosely connected; (2) simple, with one term of comparison; (3) unusual forms which Horace uses in certain of his comparisons; (4) comparisons developed by accessory circumstances; (5) a few accumulated comparisons.

[4]A Classification of the Similes of Homer, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 13.147–150, 154–159; A Classification of the Similes in the Argonautica of Apollonius of Rhodes, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 14.162–166; A Classification of the Similes in Vergil's Aeneid and Georgics, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 14.170–174; A Classification of the Similes of Ovid, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 25.73–78, 81–86.

[5]Prisciani De Praexercitamentis Rhetoricis, Chapter 1, Section 25, in Heinrich Keil, Grammatici Latini, 3.437 (Leipzig, Teubner, 1860).

[6]Quoted by Manucci, 6–7 (see note 1, above).

[7]An illustration, however, like a simile, is sometimes introduced by *sic*.

[8]These are as follows: Hypsaea's blindness (1.2.91–92); Hagna's wen that delights Balbus (1.3.40); Sisyphus, a favorite dwarf of Antony (1.3.46–47); Labeo's madness (1.3.83); Caelius and Birrius, highway robbers (1.4.69); Caprius and Sulcius, feared by Caelius and Birrius (1.4.70); a bilingual Canusian (1.10.30); Etruscan Cassius (1.10.62); Naevius, furnishing greasy water to guests (2.2.68–69).

[9]See A Classification of the Similes of Ovid, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 25.74, and note 12.

[10]The number of similes and verses in each book, arranged in order of frequency of occurrence, is as follows: Epodes, 33 similes in 625 verses; Carmina 4, 21 in 582; Epistulae 2, 26 in 962; Sermones 1, 27 in 1030; Carmina 3, 25 in 1004; Epistulae 1, 24 in 1006; Carmina 1, 21 in 876; Sermones 2, 23 in 1083; and Carmina 2, 7 in 572.

the Sermones or the Epistulae; they do not figure at all in the Carmina. This category, by the way, begins with Horace. No previous poet draws similes from myths and legends to a like extent, although Vergil shares in the tendency to draw from this source, a source which Ovid and later poets used still more freely.

Eighty-seven of the similes of Horace are very brief, consisting of one or two words only, a type of simile common to every class of poetry. They constitute considerably over one-third of the total number, a larger proportion than in Vergil, and slightly larger than in Apollonius of Rhodes, but decidedly smaller than in Homer[11]. Of further similes we distinguish, as previously, two main types, one consisting of a relatively simple statement, with or without a brief modifying phrase or clause, and occupying, as a rule, not more than two verses, the other, longer and more detailed, usually occupying several verses and giving a picture complete in itself. Both of these types occur in epic poetry freely, but the long detailed simile is so common there that it constitutes an outstanding characteristic of the epic style. In lyric poetry, on the other hand, the long simile is of comparatively rare occurrence, and the simile of intermediate length is the prevailing type. In elegiac poetry in particular, as we saw in the case of Ovid[12], the simile most frequently occupies one verse of a distich and its application the other, or the simile and its application each occupy a couplet. In the poetry of Horace, consisting as it does in part of satire, written in dactylic hexameter, in part of lyric poetry written largely in the simple stanza form, we find only 19 similes which exceed two verses in length. Very nearly half of these are in the Carmina, five of them, including the longest of all, in Book 4. With one exception—the simile in Ars Poetica 361–365, in which Horace compares poetry to a painting—, no simile in either the Sermones or the Epistulae occupies four full verses. We may conclude, then, that, in Horace at least, the similes of satire are predominantly of the lyric rather than of the epic type. Four of the 19 similes of more than two verses occur in the Epodes: the longest is the simile involving the Phocaeans (16.17–22). The longer similes in the Carmina which call for mention are the simile of the fawn, in 1.23.1–8; the comparison of life to a river, now gliding peacefully *in medio alveo*, now in flood, in 3.29.33–41; the simile comparing Drusus to an eagle, in 4.4.1–12, followed by the shorter, but very compact one comparing him to a young lion (13–16); the simile from a mother watching and praying for her long-detained son, in 4.5.9–14; and, perhaps, the comparison of Claudius to the Aufidus in near-flood stage, in 4.14.25–28, and Horace's comparison of himself to a bee of Matina, in 4.2.28–32. All except the last of these are recognizably like the distinctively epic simile in content and in general structure, as well as in length, for the most part at least, and the bee simile is not far removed therefrom. The remaining ten similes exceeding two verses in length[13]

do not fill more than three or four verses. Most of them belong without question with the other 104 of the intermediate, or prevailingly lyric, group.

Many of Horace's similes, however, give the illusion of being longer than they are, because of his characteristic use of metaphor in their application. Take, for example, Epodes 6.5–8,

> nam qualis aut Molossus aut fulvus Lacon
>   amica vis pastoribus,
> agam per altas aure sublata nives
>   quaecumque praecedit fera....,

and Carmina 4.2.5–8,

> monte decurrens velut amnis imbres
> quem super notas aluere ripas
> fervet immensusque ruit profundo
>   Pindarus ore....

In both instances the simile proper occupies but two verses, consisting of one statement with a modifying phrase in the first passage, and a phrase and a clause in the second, but the application in the last two verses is couched in metaphorical language which carries on the figure.

Again, many of Horace's similes seem less brief because of his power of compact expression, achieved in part through the free use of the participle, as, for example, in Carmina 1.15.29–30 (31),

> quem tu, cervus uti vallis in altera
> visum parte lupum graminis immemor,
> ....fugies....

A more conspicuous instance occurs in Carmina 4.4.13–16, which I have classed with similes of the epic type. The poet has spread his simile of the eagle swooping upon its prey over the first three stanzas of the Ode, and, wishing to make his introduction to the poem in praise of Drusus the stronger by adding a second simile, he characteristically packs it into smaller compass (13–16)[14]:

> qualemve laetis caprea pascuis
> intenta fulvae matris ab ubere
>   iam lacte depulsum leonem
>   dente novo peritura vidit....

This simile of the young lion and the she-goat is, as I have said, the second of a pair introducing the poem. The use of similes in pairs is another noteworthy characteristic of Horace's style, although it is not peculiar to him. A few such pairs occur in the Argonautica. Vergil has more than Horace, 36, against Horace's 24. Vergil has four groups of three similes illustrating the same point, and Horace two such groups, besides three others (in each instance counted, herein, as one) in which the verb of the simile has three or four different subjects[15].

A further characteristic of Horace's style in presenting his similes, and one essentially peculiar to him, is his occasional use of what we might term inversion. When in Carmina 1.16.5–8 (9) he wishes to say forcefully that anger puts one in a worse state of frenzy than Cybele or Liber, he states this thought the other way around:

---

[11]See A Classification of the Similes of Ovid, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 25.74, and note 14.   [12]Ibidem, 73.
[13]These are in Carmina 1.8.13–16, 3.25.8–12; Epodes 1.19–22, 10.12–14, 14.9–12; Sermones 1.1.32, 114–116, 3.86–89, 2.3.48–51; Epistulae 2.3.374–376.

[14]This economy of style shows the influence of Pindar, of course, as does the structure of the poem as a whole.
[15]For Ovid's use of similes in pairs and in groups of three or more see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 25.74 (see note 11, above).

Non Dindymene, non adytis quatit
mentem sacerdotum incola Pythius,
non Liber aeque, non acuta
sic geminant Corybantes aera
tristes ut irae....

Again, in Carmina 4.14.25–28 (30), in comparing Claudius's course with the *tauriformis Aufidus*, he introduces the simile with *sic*, and <*Claudius*>...*diruit* with *ut*. Horace's love for geographical details is evident in his similes, as elsewhere in his poetry. Witness the swollen Aufidus, the winds in the forests of Garganus, and the temper of the Adriatic sea.

An attempt to trace the literary source of Horace's similes and to determine how far the poet may be original in his use of the figure is largely baffled, of course, by the fact that the works of his more immediate models exist for the most part in fragments only. One of the similes in the Ars Poetica was quite evidently suggested by Lucilius, and four others in the Sermones and the Epistulae may have been. The simile in Carmina 1.12.47–48 seems to echo a lovely simile in Sappho, although Sappho is not alone in using the figure. How many more of Horace's similes may have been influenced by her and by Alcaeus, by Archilochus, and by Lucilius we can only conjecture. But Horace's indebtedness did not end with the avowed models of his poems. We can see traces of the influence of Homer, Pindar, Anacreon, Theocritus, Lucretius, and other Greek and earlier Latin poets.

In the following classification the similes which seem to derive, ultimately at least, from similes in Homer, to the extent of being drawn from the same object and with a like point of application, are marked with a *; the few which to the same extent resemble similes in the Argonautica are marked with a ‡. For those which bear some resemblance to similes by other poets references are given in the notes.

I. SIMILES DRAWN FROM NATURAL PHENOMENA[15a]

  A. From the Phenomena of the Heavens

    1. From the moon

      a. Shining among the stars—C.1.12.47–48[16].

      b. Reflected on the sea—C.2.5.19–20[17].

      ‡c. Its crescent shape at its third rising—C.4.2.57–58[18].

    2. From the stars

      ‡*a. The brightness of a star—C.3.1.42.

      *b. The beauty of a star—C.3.9.21[19].

      *c. Hesperus, its radiance—C.3.19.26.

  B. From Atmospheric Phenomena

    1. From the weather

      a. Its changeableness—S.2.3.268.

      b. The heat of Apulia—E.3.15–16[20].

    2. From the wind

      *a. Dispelling clouds after a storm—C.1.7.15–17.

      b. Its swiftness

        *(1) In driving clouds—C.2.16.23–24.

        (2) In driving over the Sicilian Sea—C.4.4.43–44[21].

      ‡*c. Its noise in the forests <of Garganus>—Ep.2.1.202[22].

      *d. Fretting the sea when the Pleiades show through storm clouds—C.4.14.20–22.

      *e. Raising dust (in Campania)—S.2.8.55–56.

    3. From the thunderbolt, its force—C.3.16.10–11[23].

  C. From Fire Phenomena

    1. From the swift action of fire—C.4.4.43–44.

    2. From the heat of the fire burning in Mt. Aetna—E.17.30–33[24].

  D. From Water Phenomena

    1. From streams

      a. From streams in general

        (1) A stream strong and clear—Ep.2.2.120.

        (2) A swift surging stream—S.1.7.26–27, 10.62[25].

        (3) A stream in flood—C.4.2.5–6.

        (4) A stream's changefulness, now gliding quietly, now in flood—C.3.29.33–41[26].

      b. From specific rivers

        (1) The Aufidus, rolling on at near-flood stage—C.4.14.25–28.

        (2) The Hebrus, cold and clear—Ep.1.16.13.

    2. From sea phenomena

      *a. From the waves of the sea, their succession—Ep.2.2.176.

      ‡*b. From the roar of the Tuscan Sea—Ep.2.1.202.

      c. From the Adriatic Sea, its roughness—C.1.33.15–16, 3.9.22–23.

[15a]To save space, in the rest of this paper, abbreviations will be used as follows: A. = Ars Poetica; C. = Carmina; E. = Epodes; Ep. = Epistulae; S. = Sermones.

[16]Compare Sappho, Fragment 86.8–15 (J. M. Edmonds, Lyra Graeca 1.246–247 [The Loeb Classical Library, 1922]). See also Bacchylides, Epinicia 9.27–29; Lucretius 3.1042–1044.

[17]Lucretius draws a simile from the reflection of stars in water (4.211–213), and Vergil from the reflection of sunlight or moonlight (Aeneid 8.22–25). Compare also the sunbeams playing on water in Argonautica 3.756–759. In all these instances, however, the water is contained in a vessel.

[18]Apollonius of Rhodes in describing the tail fins of Triton draws a simile from the horns of the moon (4.1615–1616). See also Moschus 2.8. Compare Ovid, Metamorphoses 3.681–682, 9.783–784.

[19]Compare Iliad 6.401 ἀλίγκιον ἀστέρι καλῷ.

[20]The simile contains an allusion to the Dog-star, whose brilliance forms the point of similes by Homer, Apollonius of Rhodes, and Vergil.

[21]Compare the metaphor in Euripides, Phoenissae 209–212 περιρρύτων ὑπὲρ ἀκαρπίστων πεδίων Σικελίας Ζεφύρου πνοαῖς ἱππεύσαντος ἐν οὐρáνῳ.

[22]Compare Aeneid 10.97–99; Georgics 4.261.

[23]...potentius ictu fulmineo. Compare Pindar, Isthmia 7.33; Lucretius 3.488 ut fulminis ictu.

[24]The burning heat of fire is the point of comparison in similes in Argonautica 3.287, 291–295. Compare also Aristophanes, Equites 382 πυρὸς γ' ἕτερα θερμότερα.

[25]Compare Vergil, Aeneid 10.603–604 torrentis aquae...more.

[26]This passage seems to have been influenced especially by Lucretius 1.280–289, although it has points of resemblance with Iliad 11.492–495. Compare Aeneid 2.496–499.

E.   From Terrestrial Phenomena

   1.   From stone

     a.   From rocks

       (1)   Storm-smitten, deaf to shipwrecked men—E.17.54–55[27].

       (2)   The deaf cliff of the Island of Icarus —C.3.7.21.

     b.   From Parian marble, its brightness—C. 1.19.6[28].

   2.   From dust, gathered by a whirlwind—S.1.4. 31.

II. SIMILES DRAWN FROM THE VEGETABLE WORLD

A.   From Seaweed, its Worthlessness—S.2.5.8[29].

B.   From the Glad Beauty of the Springtime—C.4. 5.6[30].

C.   From Ivy, Clinging—C.1.36.20; E.15.5[31].

D.   From Hemlock, its Deadly Quality—E.3.3.

*E.   From Leaves in a Forest, Falling, Giving Place to New—A.60.

F.   From Flowers

   1.   A red rose, its beauty—C.4.10.4[32].

   2.   Violets, their hue—Ep.2.1.207.

G.   From Trees

   1.   From trees in general

     a.   A tree's long-continued growth—C.1.12. 45–46.

     *b.   A young tree, strongly rooted in the hills—E.12.19–20.

   2.   From specific trees

     *a.   From oaks, their rigidity—C.3.10.17.

     b.   From an ilex tree, benefited by pruning—C.4.4.57–58.

     *c.   From a pine, hewn and falling—C.4.6. 9–10.

     ‡d.   From a cypress, uprooted by the wind— C.4.6.10[33].

III. SIMILES DRAWN FROM THE ANIMAL WORLD

A.   From a Sea-Urchin, With Bristling Spines—E.5. 27–28.

B.   From Insects

   1.   From an ant, carrying material, building pile, and using it in winter—S.1.1.32–35[34].

   2.   From a bee, busily sucking thyme—C.4.2. 27–31[35].

C.   From Snakes

   1.   A snake in general—Ep.1.17.30.

   2.   A viper's blood—C.1.8.10[36].

   3.   A snake of Epidaurus, keen of eye—S.1.3. 26–27.

   4.   African snakes, their fierce character—C.3. 10.18; S.2.8.95.

D.   From Birds

   1.   A bird afraid that snake may attack her nest when she is away—E.1.19–22[37].

   2.   A crow, its age—C.4.13.24–25[38].

‡*3.   A hawk pursuing doves—C.1.37.17–18[39].

   4.   An eagle

     a.   Keen of eye—S.1.3.26–27.

     *b.   A young eagle, driven from nest, swooping on fold, and attacking snakes—C. 4.4.1–12[40].

E.   From Mammals

   1.   From beasts in general, their promiscuousness—S.1.3.109[41].

---

[34]There is a certain resemblance between verses 36–38, which follow this ant simile, and Lucilius, 561–562 (Marx). This resemblance George Converse Fiske discusses in his book, Lucilius and Horace, A Study in the Classical Theory of Imitation, 231–232 (University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, Number 7 [1920]). He thinks (168, 232) that the extant verses of Lucilius were preceded by a simile from the ant, suggested by Aesop's fable of the ant and the beetle (Number 295, in the edition of Halm), and that Horace has Lucilius's simile in mind. Compare Vergil, Georgics 1.185–186, and the ant simile in Aeneid 4.402–407.

[35]See Whitney Jennings Oates, The Influence of Simonides of Ceos upon Horace, 98–100, and note 204 (Princeton University Press, 1932), for a comparison of this simile with Simonides, Fragment 47 (edition of Bergk), and a list of passages in Greek and Latin literature in which a poet is compared to a bee. One of these passages is Plato, Ion 534 A. With this, as Mr. Oates observes, the context of Horace's simile has points in common, whether the fact was present to Horace's mind or not. Pindar's use of the bee three times in simile or in metaphor (Pythia 4.60, 10.54, and Fragment 152) might easily suggest the figure to Horace when he wished to contrast himself with Pindar, whose style and themes he has just described. Yet Horace's simile reads a little more like that of Simonides, which is as follows: ὁμιλεῖ δ' ἄνθεσιν <ὥτε> μελίσσα ξανθὸν μέλι μηδομένα.

[36]The blood of a viper does not occur in a comparison elsewhere, but the deadly power of the viper occurs in a simile in Euripides, Andromache 271. Its sharp grip is the point of a simile in Aeschylus, Supplices 896, and its lurking quality in Sophocles, Antigone 531. See also Ovid, Ars Amatoria 2.376–378, and Epistulae Ex Ponto 3.3.101–102.

[37]The bird's fear of a snake attacking her young is used in a simile in Aeschylus, Septem Contra Thebas 291–293. See also Moschus 4.21–25.

[38]For the age of the crow—nine times that of man—see Hesiod, Fragment 193; Aratus, Phaenomena 1022–1023. The cawing of the crow occurs in a simile in Pindar, Olympia 2.96.

[39]A hawk seizes a dove in a simile in Vergil, Aeneid 11.721–724. Compare Ovid, Metamorphoses 5.605–606.

[40]For a discussion of the reminiscence of Pindar in this simile see Wilamowitz, Horaz und die Griechischen Lyriker, in his Sappho und Simonides, 320–321 (Berlin, Weidmann, 1913). The eagle is called the king of birds in Pindar, Olympia 13.21, Pythia 1.7, and Isthmia 5.50. Compare Bacchylides 5.16–30. The simile is Homeric in content, as well as in its length and in its detailed structure. In a simile in Iliad 22.308–310 an eagle swoops and carries off a lamb; in one in Iliad 12.201–203 an eagle carries off a snake. Compare, further, Pindar, Nemea 3.80–81, and Vergil, Aeneid 11.751–756.

[41]Compare Vergil, Aeneid 4.550–551.

---

[27]For rocks and cliffs as a symbol of the deaf ear see Euripides, Medea 28–29. In the similes of Homer and of Apollonius of Rhodes (and of Vergil, too) this phase of the immobility of stone does not appear at all.

[28]Compare the simile in Pindar, Nemea 4.81 Παρίου λίθου λευκοτέραν.

[29]. . .vilior alga est. Compare Vergil, Eclogues 7.42 proiecta vilior alga. In both instances the words come at the end of the verse.

[30]Compare Theocritus 9.33 τᾶς < = 'song'> οὔτ' ἐὰρ ἐξαπίνας γλυκερώτερον; 12.3–8 ὅσον ἐὰρ χειμῶνος . . . ἥδιον . . . τόσσον ἐμ' εὔφρηνας σὺ φανείς; and especially 18.27, where Helen is compared to Spring.

[31]Compare Sophocles, Oedipus Coloneus 1241; Euripides, Hecuba 398, Medea 1213; Theocritus 20.22; Catullus 61.34–35, 107; Ovid, Metamorphoses 4.365.

[32]For the red rose see Pindar, Isthmia 3.36–37. However, Paley thinks that Pindar has the red anemone in mind. For the beauty of the rose in a simile compare also the anonymous epigram in Anthologia Palatina 9.610 ἔχει δ' ἡδεῖαν ὡς ῥόδον ἐν κήποις. . . .

[33]Vergil compares the Cyclops brothers to cypress trees (Aeneid 3.679–681). An uprooted pine tree occurs in a simile in Aeneid 5. 448–449.

2. From domestic animals

  a. From a lamb shuddering at wolves—E. 12.25–26.

  b. From goats

    (1) A goat sporting wantonly—C.3.15. 12.

    *(2) She-goats shuddering at lions—E. 12.25–26[42].

  c. From cattle

    (1) A bull, promiscuous among herd— S.1.3.109–110.

    (2) ...podex velut crudae bovis—E.8. 6.

  d. From horses

    (1) A three-year-old colt, sporting in field, fearing touch—C.3.11.9–10[43].

    (2) A little ass, drooping ears when too heavily loaded—S.1.9.20–21[44].

    (3) ...equina quales ubera—E.8.8.

  e. From dogs

    (1) A dog in general—Ep.1.17.30[45].

    (2) A dog's speed in running—Ep.1.18. 51.

    (3) A dog not to be torn away from oiled leather—S.2.5.83.

    (4) A hound keen in scenting boar in hiding—E.12.6[46].

    (5) Molossian or Laconian hound driving off wild beasts—E.6.5–6[47].

3. From wild animals

  a. From deer

    (1) In general, their fleetness—C.2.16. 23–24.

    *(2) A deer fleeing at sight of wolf in distance—C.1.15.29–30.

    (3) A fawn seeking its mother in the mountains—C.1.23.1–8[48].

  b. From beasts of prey

    (1) In general, a hunted beast—E.5.9–10.

    (2) From the wild boar

      *(a) Its strength—Ep.1.18.51.

      (b) Its bristling mane—E.5.27–28.

    (3) From wolves

      *(a) At discord with lambs—E.4.1.

      (b) Their enmity with goats—C.1. 33.7–8[49].

(4) From a bear, breaking cage and putting men to flight—A.472–473[50].

(5) From a tiger—C.1.23.9[51].

(6) From lions

  (a) A Gaetulian lion—C.1.23.10[52].

  (b) A newly-weaned lion, suddenly seen by doomed she-goat—C. 4.4.13–16.

  *(c) Lionesses seizing and rending calves—C.3.11.41–42[53].

c. From the fabulous unicorn—S.1.5.56–57[54].

IV. SIMILES DRAWN FROM HUMAN BEINGS, THEIR ACTIVITIES AND EXPERIENCES

A. From Men of Non-Roman Nationality

  1. The King of the Persians, his happiness—C. 3.9.4.

  2. The Parthians, prone to deceive—Ep.2.1. 112[55].

  3. The Jews, proselyting—S.1.4.142–143.

B. From Women and their Experiences

  1. From a matron

    a. Differing from a *meretrix*, even in dress— Ep.1.18.3–4.

    b. Bidden to dance on feast days—A.232–233.

  2. From a mother watching and praying for storm-detained son—C.4.5.9–14[56].

  3. From a step-mother—E.5.9.

  4. From a Spartan woman, with hair neatly arranged—C.2.11.23–24.

  5. From a Sabine or sunburned Apulian spouse —E.2.41–42.

C. From Children

  *1. A three-year-old child building houses in the sand—S.2.3.251–252[57].

  2. A child reciting dictation given by teacher— Ep.1.18.13–14.

  3. A boy enjoying the short Spring holidays— Ep.2.2.197–198.

D. From Youths, Coming to Flower—A.62.

(To be Continued)

Hood College,
Frederick, Maryland　　Eliza Gregory Wilkins

---

[42]Goats fear a lion in a simile in Homer, Iliad 11.383.

[43]This passage may have been suggested by a passage (not a simile) in Anacreon, Fragment 75. A simile comparing a girl to an untamed colt occurs in Fragment 9 of the Greek comic poet Epicrates (see Theodor Koch, Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta, 2.285 [Leipzig, Teubner, 1884]). Compare also Eubulus, Fragment 75 (Koch, Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta, 2.191).

[44]For the heavily laden ass in a simile see Tyrtaeus, Fragment 6, in Anthologia Lyrica (edition of Hiller, 1897).

[45]Used in jest at the Cynic. Compare Lucilius, 1095 *canino ritu*.

[46]The hound follows an animal by scent in a simile in Plautus, Miles Gloriosus 267. Compare also Ennius, Annales 340–341 (in J. Vahlen, Ennianae Poesis Reliquiae², pages 60–61 [Leipzig, Teubner, 1903]).

[47]Compare Sophocles, Ajax 8.

[48]Compare simile in Anacreon, Fragment 52 ἀγανῶς οἷά τε νέβρον νεοθηλέα γαλαθηνὸν, ὅστ' ἐν ὕλῃ κεροέσσης ἀπολειφθεὶς ὑπὸ μητρὸς ἐπτοήθη. See also Euripides, Bacchae 866–876.

[49]The enmity is implied by stating the absurd opposite: prius Apuliae iungentur caprae lupis quam turpi Pholoe peccet adultero.

[50]This is the first instance of a bear in a simile. One occurs, however, in a simile in Ovid, Metamorphoses 13.802.

[51]Neither Homer nor Apollonius of Rhodes draws similes from the tiger, but Vergil does (Aeneid 9.730).

[52]See Homer, Iliad 11.113–119.

[53]See Homer, Iliad 5.161–162; Euripides, Iphigeneia Taurica 297.

[54]*Equi te esse feri similem dico.* That a unicorn is meant is shown by the verses which follow. Pliny, Naturalis Historia 8.21, says that the unicorn is asperrima fera, reliquo corpore equo similis. Fiske (309) finds the prototype of Horace's simile in Lucilius, 117–118 dente adverso eminulo hic est rinoceros (see note 34, above).

[55]Ovid has a simile from the Parthians' well-known trick of fleeing backwards (Ars Amatoria 785–786).

[56]This simile may be reminiscent of Homer, Iliad 2.289–294.

[57]See 247–248 also. For a child at play, in an imaginary comparison, see Ep. 2.1.99–100.